

seek to gut programs that allow American families to make ends meet, over \$160 billion a year in corporate welfare is buried in our Tax Code in the form of giveaways and loopholes.

It is indefensible to ask Americans to sacrifice without asking big business to do its fair share. I challenge the majority to cut aid to dependent corporations.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE  
BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT,  
1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 169 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 169

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 302(f) or 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report are waived. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during future consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by this resolution. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to find passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 169 is a structured rule, providing for the consideration of H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

The rule waives section 302(f), prohibiting consideration of legislation which exceeds a committee's allocation of new entitlement authority, and section 308(a) which requires a cost estimate in committee reports on new entitlement authority of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule also waives clause 2, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations of legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, and clause 6, prohibiting re-appropriations, of rule XXI against provisions in the bill.

In addition, the rule makes in order only the amendments printed in the report on the rule, to be offered only in the order printed, by the Member specified, and debatable for the time specified in the report. The amendments are considered as read and are not subject to amendment or a demand for a division of the question in the House or Committee of the Whole. Also, all points of order are waived against the amendments.

House Resolution 169 permits the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone consideration of a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and to reduce to 5 minutes the time for voting after the first of a series of votes.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, as in last year's legislative branch appropriations rule, House Resolution 169 is a fairly standard structured rule to allow for the consideration of H.R. 1854. Amendments were made in order that allow the full House to make changes in areas where there are true differences of opinion. Last year, a total of 43 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee and 12 of those were made in order. This year, 33 amendments were filed at the Rules Committee, and House Resolution 169 makes 11 in order. Of this year's group of filed amendments, less than one-half, by the way, Mr. Speaker, of the amendments filed were submitted on time and several were repetitive. A full dozen of these amendments

dealt with franked mail and the Rules Committee made three amendments that affect Members mailings in order. We also allow amendments that would restore functions that some Members want to retain. In addition, we allow the full House to vote on an amendment that would allow Members to return unspent portions of their office expense allotments to the Treasury to be used for deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege in being the only Member of Congress to currently serve on both of the Speaker-appointed committees, and in my role on the Committee on House Oversight, I am very proud of the reforms achieved in H.R. 1854 based on the recommendations by House Oversight. We had some tough choices to make, but getting our own House in order and tightening our own buckles is a necessary step if we are ever going to achieve a balanced Federal budget; which is, of course, our goal.

H.R. 1854 incorporates House Oversight plans to revolutionize the internal workings of the House of Representatives, and over the next few months alone, save the taxpayers \$7 million by streamlining operations. This bill is below the subcommittee's 602(B) allocation and is over 8 percent below last year's spending level. H.R. 1854 eliminates, consolidates and reduces, paving the way for privatization of functions that will likely be less costly when performed in some instances by the private sector. Quite frankly, House Oversight and the legislative branch subcommittee did such a fine job that there really is not much room for improvement by way of further reductions on the floor.

I would like at this time to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative, and of course the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, for their excellent work in bringing this bill forward. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that House Resolution 169 is a necessarily structured and yet fair rule, and I would urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we reluctantly oppose this rule for the legislative branch appropriations bill.

We are aware of the dilemma faced by the new majority in fashioning a rule for the consideration of this spending bill, which has for the past several years has proved especially contentious. We very much would like to be able to support this rule, but we do not oppose it because it makes in order only 11 of the 33 amendments that met the required pre-filing deadline. We do not oppose it because it waives points of order against provisions in the bill

that violate House rules. We do not oppose this rule because it does not represent the "free and open legislative process" under which amendments are not blocked—the type of rule promised by the gentleman from New York—who is now the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Rules—when we debated the rule on this same spending measure last year.

Mr. Speaker, we oppose this modified closed rule because it does not make in order amendments that deal with some of the most significant issues raised by the spending priorities in the bill. We oppose the rule because it denies Members the opportunity to vote on important reform and spending amendments.

During committee consideration of the rule late yesterday, we sought to make in order those amendments; our attempts were defeated each time on a party-line vote.

We argued that Members of the House should be allowed to vote on the deficit reduction lockbox amendment offered by Representatives BREWSTER and HARMAN. After all, the hallmark of the bill before us is that it cuts the spending of the legislative branch of Government; ends several of its functions and programs, and turns others over to the private sector.

As a consequence, we felt it only fair that the House have the opportunity to debate what happens to those savings, and whether or not they can be directly applied to reducing the Federal deficit.

Unfortunately, the majority on the committee voted once again to deny Representatives BREWSTER and HARMAN the opportunity to address this deficit reduction issue on the floor of the House.

We also felt strongly that a responsible amendment dealing with funding for the Office of Technology Assessment should be in order. The OTA is a nonpartisan research organization that provides Congress with valuable and timely information about issues in the legislation we are considering. It has strong bipartisan support in the Congress. Many of us on both sides of the aisle are concerned that the Appropriations Committee has acted precipitously in eliminating funding for this important research arm of Congress.

The rule makes in order one of the two amendments filed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] which is written to retain a smaller version of the OTA. Unfortunately, the amendment made in order is not the one favored by the author; he testified before the Rules Committee that he preferred his amendment that retains for the OTA some of the autonomy it currently has, and which has been a large part of its success.

The amendment required a waiver of the rule prohibiting legislative provisions in an appropriations bill. But, Mr. Speaker, since the rule itself provides a waiver of this point of order for other provisions in the bill and also waives all points of order against the

amendments that are allowed, we felt it would have been equitable and certainly not unreasonable to protect the amendment Mr. HOUGHTON had hoped would be made in order.

The majority on the committee also refused to make in order several reform amendments, including one offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] to abolish the Joint Committee on Taxation. The Schroeder amendment should have been made in order, especially since the new majority intends to end or weaken one of its major functions—reviewing the tax returns of individuals and corporations with refunds that exceed \$1 million, a function that saved the taxpayers of this country \$16 million last year alone.

Our colleagues will also remember, of course, that we have, in the past, come to rely on the Joint Tax Committee as a voice of independence. But recent actions, including the 300-page report on the billionaire expatriates, have called its autonomous nature into question.

This amendment, along with another offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], to eliminate funding now for the Joint Economic Committee, would have helped in our effort to streamline congressional operations, as well as save taxpayers money.

We are also being denied the opportunity to bring a gift ban to a vote. The committee refused to make in order an amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACC], that would have prohibited the acceptance of gifts by Members, their staffs, and the officers of the House.

As Members know, Mr. Speaker, we have been attempting to vote on a gift ban since the first day of this Congress, when the majority voted down a rules change that would have implemented a similar provision as a House rule.

We believe that officially ending this practice of accepting gifts would go a long way toward restoring faith in Congress by removing the appearance of impropriety by Members. This amendment would have given us the chance to vote on this important issue, the resolution of which has been dragged out far too long.

Mr. Speaker, this rule unfortunately also denies us the right to vote on another long-overdue congressional reform, a bipartisan amendment that would have ended the personal use of frequent flier miles by Members of Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we believe the Members of this body deserve the chance to debate and vote on a handful of amendments that could, in fairness, have been made in order by this modified closed rule. They addressed important congressional reform issues and the continuation of the OTA with some semblance of autonomy; they should have been a part of today's debate, and should not have been denied consideration.

This legislation is obviously essential if we want to continue to do well what

we were sent here to do: Represent the people in our districts and legislate with their best interests and the interests of the Nation in mind at all times.

Mr. Speaker, we regret that we are unable to support the rule for this very important legislation.

We urge our colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we will be able to consider the important budget and reform amendments that were denied by the majority of the Committee on Rules and locked out of the amendment process.

If the Brewster-Harman lockbox amendment and the Baldacci gift ban amendment had been made in order, we would have had more spending cuts and more reform, and we shall ask our colleagues to give us the opportunity to make these important amendments part of the process today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I will not consume very much time. Let me just say I rise in strong support of the rule. Like most of the rules on legislative branch appropriations bills adopted by the House in recent years, this is a structured rule. My colleague from Miami, FL, has so stated. He is a very valuable member of our Committee on Rules and also a very, very important member of the Committee on House Oversight. As he has stated, the rule provides for the consideration of a total of 11 amendments, or substitute amendments, 5 of which are Republicans', 4 of which are Democrats', and 2 of which are bipartisan.

□ 1040

The rule will give the House an opportunity to work its will on most of the major issues relating to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I heard some criticism of this rule and of the bill before us, but let me tell Members how important this is. We have just enacted a budget in this Congress which is going to realize a balanced budget in 7 years. I would have preferred to have it be 5 years, but, nevertheless, 7 years guaranteed, I think, is certainly a step in the right direction.

What does this legislative appropriation bill do? This sets the tone for exactly what we are going to be doing throughout the entire Federal Government when we restructure that government. We have reduced committees, we have reduced subcommittees, and, to drive a point home, that means 833 fewer employees, 833 fewer employees. If you look at my good friend RON PACKARD's committee report on page 16, it talks about the savings that are arrived at from reducing 833 employees. That means less taxpayers' money that goes to the contribution to pension

benefits for employees and for Members of Congress, it means less taxpayers' money that is appropriated to pay the congressional employees' share of health care costs, and so it goes, on and on and on.

Well, if that saves several million dollars, just think what is going to happen when we abolish the Department of Education, with 7,000 employees; when we abolish the Department of Commerce with 36,000 employees; and the Department of Energy with 18,000 employees. Think how fewer contributions there are going to be of taxpayer dollars going to benefits for those employees of the Federal work force. We are not reducing the amount for the Federal work force that pays for those benefits, but we are reducing the total amount of dollars. That is what we need to do.

So for anyone who wants to vote against this rule or the legislative appropriations bill, they are making a big mistake, because this does set that tone. For the first time in years I am going to vote for a legislative appropriations bill, because it reduces the spending on this Congress and sets the right tone. I urge all Members to do the same thing.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT].

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because, among other reasons, the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], preserving OTA, was not put in order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment to retain OTA. I have served on the OTA board for 4 years, and I feel strongly that this agency should be retained.

I have three main points I want to make concerning OTA in my brief comments today. My first point is that the work of OTA is not simply a luxury to Congress, the work done by OTA cannot and will not be replicated by any other organization.

Second, I want to point out that OTA exists as a result of growing awareness over the early part of the 20th century of the ever-increasing need for sound scientific analysis in policymaking. Much careful thought went into creating OTA, and we should be equally careful as we consider what its future should be.

Congress will not get a lot of symbolic mileage out of eliminating OTA. With all the inefficient organizations we have to cut in the Federal Government, eliminating a small agency that is considered a model of efficiency by experts across the political spectrum is not the way to score political points.

During the joint hearing on congressional support agencies on February 2 of this year, a number of experts on congressional reform from across the political spectrum discussed OTA. Each witness praised the expertise of OTA

reports, and several witnesses noted that OTA could serve as a model of efficiency and organization for other government entities.

No one questioned the objectivity of OTA, nor were there serious concerns raised about the utility of their reports. The only argument made for eliminating OTA was that the organization was not essential to the Congress. The question then comes down to the necessity of having OTA continue its work for Congress.

I think we all can agree that Congress is being called upon to legislate in a world which only becomes more technically complex, we clearly have a need for good technical analysis from an objective and professional organization.

Some say we should go directly to the outside experts, and that objective and balanced advice should be obtained that way. This is based on the belief that professional standards in the technical fields are sufficient that Congress does not need an office to help sort out competing scientifically based claims.

As a medical professional, I know enough about science to know that there is a lot of ground for differing interpretation and presentation of scientific facts. In my own field, I can make judgments about what constitutes solid evidence. But we are incapable of making those sorts of judgments outside of our own fields. I would have very little basis to judge good or bad scientific advice outside of my own area of medicine.

In OTA, we keep on hand a small but highly trained group of experts in numerous technology related fields. They have no institutional or economic agenda to push. They exist to sort out competing arguments, to explain seemingly contradictory facts, and then present them to us so that we may make our policy decisions with these complicated scientific perspectives sorted out.

Here is an example of why it would be difficult to rely directly on experts or the private sector to fill the functions of OTA.

Many of us have been concerned over the past several years about the emergence of bacterial disease resistant to many of our antibiotics. What is unknown is how serious a problem this truly is, and how we should deal with it. Presumably we could go directly to the experts, the microbiologists and infectious disease specialists.

But we might expect these professionals could have a conflict of interest, and might overstate the problem, in hopes of obtaining more funding for surveillance and basic research. OTA has no stake in this issue other than to serve the policymaking needs of the Congress.

They can afford to be objective and ask the question, Is this truly a public health crisis, and what needs to be done about it? The OTA is just a few months away from having a report completed on this question, and it will

almost certainly shed important light on a problem which is a significant cause for public concern.

We must recognize that OTA exists as a result of a long history of recognition by Federal policymakers that policy requires data and analysis. The National Academy of Sciences argued for the creation of OTA, because they—among others—recognized that the pace of science demanded an expanded capacity for Congress to obtain balanced technical advice.

The number of scientific and technology issues, the pace of change and the complexity of these issues will only increase in the next decade. It strikes me as precisely the wrong time for impulsive acts like the elimination of an entity that exists because of a long, carefully considered need for such assistance.

OTA was not some luxury created based on some monetary whim. OTA exists because policymakers found a significant gap that was not filled by the existing experts, think tanks, academic centers, or other sources.

The National Academy of Sciences, Institute of Medicine and National Academy of Engineering continues to this day to strongly support the continuation of OTA.

Furthermore, we should not expect that an entity like OTA can be quickly recreated. OTA has accumulated an experienced staff in an amazingly broad range of science and technology issues, and that have a considerable amount of institutional memory in addition to their technical expertise.

A hasty decision to fire these professionals would undo many years of careful thought and painstaking hiring.

The American people sent a lot of new people to Congress in November to act; but they did not send them here to act impulsively or with shortsightedness. I think that if we have learned anything it is that the public can usually tell the difference.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a structured rule, a rule that I think is very fair. It will give complete opportunity for us to debate every issue that I think is important to be debated. Frankly, I want to express my appreciation as chairman of the subcommittee to the Committee on Rules for providing us with this very fair and open opportunity for debate.

In reference to OTA, I must make some comment. We will have a complete opportunity to debate OTA. There are two amendments made in order. One is to restore virtually all of OTA to where it is now, 85 percent of it. Then a second amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON]. We will have complete opportunity to debate OTA. Frankly, I

think that the Committee on Rules was very fair in that area.

I also want the Members of the House to know that we spent considerable time and effort in trying to craft a bill that would do some of the fundamental things that Congress and we think the voters have called upon the House to do, and that is to downsize Government, and to start with themselves.

This bill does that. This sets the model. This sets the mold for all the rest of Government to follow in downsizing, in consolidating, in eliminating, and in cutting those areas that Government needs to cut, and we have started with the Congress and the related agencies that support the Congress in this bill.

It is a very good bill. We have given considerable effort and bipartisan debate before we come to the floor of the House to it. This rule gives us a chance to debate those very issues that were debated and were still controversial in the committee and subcommittee. We do not believe there should be any need for additional amendments. In fact, we would have preferred less amendments. But the Committee on Rules, in their good judgment, balanced the amendments to both sides of the aisle, and we think that we will have an opportunity to debate the important issues.

We like the rule, we appreciate the Committee on Rules, and I strongly urge the Members of the House to vote in support of the resolution.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today we take up the 2d of our 13 appropriations bills, this time the legislative branch appropriations bill. Sadly, the rule on this bill once again does not include the Brewster-Harman bipartisan lockbox amendment.

Later today we will also resume consideration and vote on the military construction appropriations bill. The rule on that bill did not include the Brewster-Harman bipartisan lockbox amendment.

Let me explain what is sad about this and why I will vote against the rule to this bill and the rule to future appropriations bills, so long as they do not include the Brewster-Harman bipartisan lockbox amendment.

The lockbox is a very simple concept. It is supported by or was supported by 418 Members of this House and I believe all members of the Committee on Rules when it was voted on earlier this spring. What it says is a cut is a cut. It is a mechanism whereby when we cut spending on an appropriations bill, as we did last Friday when we voted down a proposal for an Army museum that would cost \$14 million, the money that is saved is scored in a lockbox. It could be called anything, but it is separately

and identifiably set aside. That means that when the House bill passes, that lockbox money is identified. When the Senate bill passes, whatever is in the Senate lockbox is identified, and the conferees are required to come out with a figure somewhere between the House and Senate number. That final amount in savings must go to deficit reduction.

These are not actual dollar bills that are in a box. This is less money that has to be borrowed, and it is money that comes off the 602(b) allocation.

I want to explain to my colleagues if we do not do this, we are deceiving the American people. We are saying that we are cutting spending, when we are not. Instead, we are giving a certain kind of power to the appropriators that the American people do not understand that they have. It is not the right thing to do in this House in my view, to cut spending and then to reallocate that spending without people knowing about it.

So one more time, colleagues, deficit hawks, all of you, let me urge that we change this rule to make in order the Brewster-Harman lockbox amendment and that we make clear to the American people that we are not kidding, that the money saved comes off the bottom line, and that the deficit will go down because of the courageous actions we take in this body.

Vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague and dear friend, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, for yielding me this time. I must say that it has been a pleasure to have him on the Committee on Rules and I am pleased to see him managing these legislative efforts.

Mr. Speaker, in the time I have been in Congress, we have had much discussion about the need to look close to home as we work to bring balance to our Federal budget. Not only is there an actual real need to clamp down on unnecessary and lower priority spending—but there is also a very important symbolic need behind that effort. My mail strongly suggests the American people are willing to make some sacrifices in order to bring down our deficit and begin paying off our debt. But they want to be sure that the sacrifice is spread fairly, all the way around—and they sure want to know that their elected officials are leading the way, not hiding behind some royal velvet curtain in the castle or the Imperial Congress. I am very proud of the work done by our friends on the legislative branch subcommittee in bringing us H.R. 1854, the bill that outlines our own budget up here on the Hill for the com-

ing year. The subcommittee made some very real cuts—reflecting the action we took on the opening day in cutting our staff budgets by one-third and in reducing the actual dollars we intend to spend next fiscal year by 8.2 percent from what we are spending this year. That is a real cut—not just slower growth or some budgetary hocus-pocus. Still, though the committee has done good work—there are Members who have ideas about further cuts and ways to change priorities in how the money is spent. Although appropriations bills are privileged and could come straight to the floor without a rule, this bill requires certain waivers as explained by my colleague from Florida. In addition, because we are under a tight time schedule to complete our work on all the appropriations bills, our Rules Committee chose to follow recent precedent and provide a structured rule, which was reported by our committee on a voice vote. This rule provides for consideration of 11 amendments—including several proposals for additional cuts in Members' franking. I am a strong proponent of reducing the allowances Members get for free mail—having spent the past 6 years fully responding to my constituents' inquiries and staying in touch—while only using a fraction of my allocation. I am certain many other Members have had similar experience of underutilization of the over generous franking allowances. Likewise, we will consider an amendment to afford Members the opportunity to return unused office funds to the Treasury for deficit reduction—an important proposal designed to change the incentives from spending toward saving. All together—the bill and this rule—provide strong testimony to the fact that Members are starting to get it—the American people want us to lead by example and that is exactly what we are doing. This doesn't reduce Congress and its Members to sackcloth and ashes. It does responsibly tighten our belts another notch or two. I urge support for this rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the moment we have no further requests for time, although such requests may yet appear. We reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for House Resolution 169, the rule which provides for consideration of H.R. 1854, appropriations for the legislative branch.

In the past, Congress has proven that it absolutely cannot restrain itself from spending taxpayers' money. This bill is a significant move to curb Congress' spending on itself. H.R. 1854 cuts the congressional budget by \$154 million in fiscal year 1996, eliminates 2,350 congressional staff positions, and

privatizes those operations that would be better provided in the open market.

The bill crafted by the Appropriations Committee continues our commitment to shrink Government, beginning with ourselves. This rule assures that the Members of the House can vote on a number of amendments that would further cut the funds that Congress spends on itself, including funds spent on congressional allowances, congressional mail, and congressional staff. While only 12 percent of amendments offered by the minority party were permitted in the last Congress on this bill, the Rules Committee will allow almost one-third of minority amendments to be considered on the House floor today.

Some amendments, such as a loosely written gift ban amendment, should not be in this bill. However, under the ill-advised amendment offered in the Rules Committee, if a group from the Fourth District of Georgia decided to hold a reception, I could be prohibited from joining the event because it was funded by interested constituents.

A House bipartisan task force is working on effective gift ban language, and the Rules Committee acted responsibly in not permitting this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we will balance the budget so that our grandchildren will not have to pay for our extravagances. We are cutting our own budget first, and are working to assure that future generations will not have to pay for the excesses of Government. I urge support for this fair rule and the bill that will create a streamlined, responsible legislative branch.

□ 1100

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill. By slashing Congress' own budget by \$154 million, this bill shows that Congress is not just asking others to make do with less money, but we are starting with ourselves.

The rule for this bill, though, allows us to go even further than the base bill. The rule makes in order a number of amendments that will cut even more funding, including an amendment to cut Members' office allowances by \$9.3 million, another amendment to cut franking funds by \$4.6 million. We allow an amendment that would further reduce the Government Printing Office and an amendment that allows Members to return the unspent portions of their office expenses to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

I have pledged to cut my office expenses by 25 percent over last year's mark and we are doing it. And I would much rather see that money go to deficit reduction than back into Congress' own spending accounts.

As we work to bring our own House in order, this rule gives us the opportunity to make additional spending cuts beyond the bill's nearly 9 percent reduction.

The American people have become increasingly disillusioned with Congress and for good reason. We have squandered their money for too long. All over this country families are tightening their belts and figuring out how to make do with less, but Congress has failed to do the same over and over again.

This bill proves to American families that we, too, are willing to do our part to help tame the budget deficit by downsizing Congress and bringing spending under control.

This bill takes an important step toward making sure that Congress learns how to do our work better for less money. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the bill.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me. Let me say that talking about how this is a good rule is like trying to put lipstick on pigs. This is a bad rule. Let me tell you why.

Some very essential amendments were denied. They were denied by the same group who promised open rules. The most essential, I think, is the one that would cut off gifts being able to be delivered to Members of Congress and their staff. I think this place should have had a gift ban from the day it started, and to think in 1995 we still do not have it is unbelievable. But we were denied the opportunity to come forward with a gift ban once and for all and say to the lobbyists, no, no, no, this place is not for sale.

So that is one reason. No. 2, if you think we ought to be paying \$6 million to the staff on the Joint Committee on Taxation who just finished preparing a 300-page document defending billionaires in America and their right to give up their citizenship and move offshore to keep from paying taxes, then you will love this rule, because the amendment that would cancel that joint committee that has absolutely no legislation was also not allowed. Those guys are there defending the fat cats, and they are going to keep them there defending the fat cats. They are the first line of defense I guess for fat cats when it comes to taxes. I think they should be gone.

It is very interesting that we cut the Select Committee on Children, the Select Committee on Hunger, the Select Committee on Aging; all of those are gone, but not the select committee that protects tax bennies, no, no, no.

They do not have any more legislative jurisdiction than the other select committees. And on children, let me tell you, the Select Committee on Children Youth and Families, which was around here for 10 years, their entire

10-year staff budget did not equal what one year is in this Joint Committee on Taxation. That was not allowed. So that amendment was not allowed, nor was the amendment to cut out the Joint Committee on Economics.

Now, let me tell you, we either do away with all select committees; I think that is a very good point, if you are going to do all of them. But to selectively just target the ones that are people oriented begins to tell you what our priorities are.

Maybe I would lose if I could offer my amendment. Maybe the gift ban would lose if we could offer that amendment. But let me tell you, anybody who votes for this rule is voting against our chance to even offer that amendment. The only thing we can do is stand down here and talk about it.

What people will then say when they go home and are asked why they did not vote to clean up the Congress and get rid of gifts, they will say, because I could not. What they are not telling is that the reason they could not was because they voted a rule out that did not allow them to clean up the place.

Let us hope people out there are sophisticated enough to ask the second question. If you cannot clean up a gift ban, who can, and why in the world would you vote for a rule that would deny the opportunity for this debate and deny the opportunity for these issues to come to the floor.

If you vote for that rule, that is exactly what you are doing. So if you love gifts coming to your office, vote for this rule. If you or your staff wants more gifts from lobbyists, vote for this rule. If you think it is a great idea to spend \$6 million a year for people to write defenses of billionaires being able to give up their citizenship and duck taxes, vote for this rule; you will love this rule. For me, I do not like this rule and I am voting "no."

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, after hearing the last speaker, I think it is very important that we clarify what exactly was attempted to be done through a gift ban in this legislation versus legislation that I have cosponsored along with other members of the bipartisan task force on reform that really will eliminate gifts from lobbyists coming to Members of this institution.

The amendment that was offered, while I recognize the intent and the spirit with which it was offered, simply said that if we discovered that someone was accepting gifts, they could not get money out of the legislative appropriations bill. What we are trying to do in my gift ban bill is not say it is OK to take gifts as long as you do not get caught, it is to say that gifts should not be accepted by Members of this body.

The amendment that the previous speaker referred to was a few sentences that did not define a gift, that did not

define a lobbyist, that left so many loopholes, it would be far too easy to ignore the plain intent of gift ban legislation.

The bill that I offered, along with other Members, by contrast defines exactly what a gift is, includes trips, includes meals, and gives Members a framework in which to know exactly what things are not permitted. It defines it clearly so that Members cannot argue that they simply did not realize that a meal from someone constitutes a gift.

So if Members are serious about outlawing gifts in this institution, which I hope they are, then it is too important to try to deal with for political purposes in some amendment that does not really truly address the problem. We need to address this problem in a way that makes it clear that we do not have loopholes, that we have an opportunity to really clean this practice up.

In my office we do not take gifts. Things that are sent to us go to a homeless shelter in the area. It is very important to me that we deal with this gift ban, but we need to do it responsibly, not through something tacked on that really will not deal with the problem.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, that is always the great excuse, that this is not the perfect amendment. So my first question is, why did you not offer yours in lieu thereof, if you did not like this one? And second, if you did not like this one, why still not allow it to come to the floor and we at least debate it? You could amend it, whatever. I think that is very important.

Third, why did you not allow the amendment to cut out the two select committees, one on taxation, one on the Joint Economic Committee? Those were also denied. That is 10 million dollars' worth of savings when you just add those two together.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, let me address the gift ban aspect. The reason that I did not offer my bill to legislative appropriations is because it is not appropriate to be legislating in an appropriations bill. I am sure the gentlewoman well knows that. This gift ban needs to be dealt with on its own merits. We need to have a discussion about this. The people of this country need to be able to see exactly what it is we are doing, and I have offered my bill and it is working its way through the process so that Members have an opportunity to know exactly what we are dealing with, that the people of this country can then have confidence that this is not some little thing that we added onto another bill that does not really mean anything, that has an enforcement mechanism, that has definitions that will allow people to really know that we are going to do away with gifts from lobbyists coming to Members of this institution.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, let me say we passed a very strong bill last year. We tried to put it through as legislation, as rules of the House at the beginning of the session. There are many of us who have a discharge petition up there trying to get it out here in one form.

As I say, we have been waiting for over 200 years in this Congress to get decent gift legislation. There is always a reason why not now, not right now. I think this is the perfect time. I thought the gentleman's amendment was excellent. I think it is a shame we would use the amendment to shut off the rule.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I will simply close by saying this: Gift ban legislation is too important to deal with it in a haphazard manner. We need to deal with it not as an add-on to a legislative appropriations bill, not as simply adding a sentence saying that if we find out you are taking gifts you will not get money from this fund.

We need to deal with it in a responsible way that the bipartisan reform task force is attempting to do, by dealing with it in a way that makes it clear to members of the public and to Members of this body that we will not take gifts and trips and meals and all the various things that the people at home have come to feel are too influential in how a law gets made.

I would urge those who are genuinely sincere in wanting to accomplish a gift ban to work with the bipartisan reform team and help us move our legislation forward that deals with this issue responsibly in a way that will make it clear to the public that the days of that influence into this body are over.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected to Congress a little shy of 6 months ago, we were faced with this revolution that was going to be taking place this session. And that revolution was going to be reforming the way the Congress operates.

We passed congressional accountability to make Congress accountable for the laws it passes and it passes on everybody else. We were told at that time that gift ban legislation would be taken up later on, and it could not be done when we tried to do it during that first day.

Now we are being told again that it cannot be done now because it is not the right time and that we want an opportunity for people to understand what is all entailed here.

I think that the people of my State and I think the people of this country understand very well what is taking place and why we do not have gift ban legislation.

□ 1115

They understand very well, whether we establish an enforcement mechanism, whether we establish a watchdog

to watch over it, they know where the majority does not want this issue to be, in front of this Congress, because it is what the American people want and what they demand.

Congress is paid a good salary. They have good benefits. There is no need to have somebody else picking up our check when we go out to eat. We get enough money to pay our own bills. We do not need people buying us tickets to go to a hockey game or to a baseball game, because we have the income and the ability to do it.

We are supposed to be serving the people of this country. We are public servants for the people. I swore an oath to the people, and that is the contract that I have. I do not know what Members are afraid of in bringing this issue up. It may not be perfect, but it will not be the only thing that is not perfect that has been brought up this session.

Mr. Speaker, I implore Members to pass this legislation. We need the Four Horsemen to pass reforms: campaign finance reform, gift ban legislation, congressional accountability. Start putting trust back into the people, so the trust will be raised within the population, so they will have faith in all of us.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to do this job. I voted for term limits. I voted for congressional accountability. I want to vote for campaign finance reform, and I want a gift ban, because it is important to get back the trust of the people in what we are doing on the issues before us. I implore the Members, I do not know what they are afraid of in addressing this issue now. I want to do it, I want to do it now, and I want the people to have their trust back in their public servants, because it is their institution, and we are here to serve them.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, this year we are embarking on a long and arduous journey to balance the budget. Our lingering deficit and staggering national debt make balancing the budget a critical necessity. We must take serious action now. We cannot afford to spend yet additional years and spend additional money before we make cuts that have already been identified.

During this process we are going to have to make many painful decisions to cut programs that are beneficial. We will have to scale back the size of Government. We will have to cut waste, set priorities for dispersing the limited pool of Federal dollars. In this spirit of eliminating waste and reducing the deficit, I had hoped to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 1996 legislative appropriations bill that would have eliminated funding for the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Joint Economic Committee has been identified as an appendage of this institution that is not needed. It is slated

for elimination in fiscal year 1997. Why should we wait for another year? By eliminating the Joint Economic Committee this year, we could save the taxpayers \$3 million.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer afford the luxury of funding redundant, duplicative Government entities such as the Joint Economic Committee. We already have budget committees, tax committees, in both the House and Senate. Earlier this year the committees in the House were reorganized, and the total number was reduced to eliminate overlap and duplications. Now, during the budget process, we should continue this effort and eliminate wasteful joint House and Senate committees.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Members for their efforts to pare down the size of the legislative branch and improve efficiency. Let us take another relatively easy step toward balancing the budget by eliminating the Joint Economic Committee now. I urge my colleagues to support this effort and save the taxpayers \$3 million. I ask, why could this rule not have allowed for that step to be taken this week?

Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER, Mr. Speaker, certainly, as the last speaker very articulately pointed out, the American people want us in Congress to act on the budget, and act with fairness to balance the budget and make some

tough spending cuts. One of the ways we can achieve that is to lead ourselves, to return money out of our congressional accounts back to the U.S. Treasury Department.

Over the last 4 years, I have returned over \$670,000. Many Members of Congress have done much better than that. What we should be able to do is have that money designated for deficit reduction and not go back into a fund that pays for other Members' mail, office accounts, salaries, whatever be the case.

A bill that I introduced on the first day of Congress this session, last session, the session before, H.R. 26, would achieve this purpose. It simply says, "Any excess funds in an account will go directly to the U.S. Treasury, and not back to the U.S. Government to be respend."

Mr. Speaker, I think this is fair. It is accountable. It shows some leadership on the part of the Congress to address the deficit. This is bipartisan legislation; 121 Members of Congress have joined with me, Democrats and Republicans joining together to do something about the budget deficit, including the acting Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON]. I will be joining tomorrow with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] to offer an amendment to have excess moneys go directly to the deficit.

I am hopeful that we can pass this legislation to account for truth in budgeting, so we do not appropriate

less money than we actually need, and count on Members to return money, and second, to show the American people that Members of Congress are going to be fiscally disciplined and make some of the tough decisions in their own office to return funds.

Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BEILENSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. Speaker, we regret we are unable to support the rule for this very important piece of legislation. We do urge our colleagues to vote against the previous question, so we will be able to consider the important budget and reform amendments that were denied by the majority of the Committee on Rules, and kept out of the amendment process.

If the Brewster-Harman lockbox amendment and the Baldacci gift ban amendment had been made in order, we would have had more spending cuts and more reform, and we shall ask our colleagues to give us the opportunity to make these important amendments part of the process today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD information regarding the floor procedure in the 104th Congress:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS: COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 5	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed: contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive: Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive: only certain substitutes	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive: considered in House no amendments	N/A
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive: 10 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open: Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision	N/A
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive: 10 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive: 10 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive: brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed: Put on suspension calendar over Democratic objection	None.
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed	H. Res. 88	Restrictive: makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive: makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive: 10 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive: 10 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive: 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive: 8 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive: 7 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive: makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive: Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(c) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive: Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive: Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive: Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive: waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A.



## FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1361 .....	Coast Guard Authorization .....	H. Res. 139	Open: waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A
H.R. 961 .....	Clean Water Act .....	H. Res. 140	Open: pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A
H.R. 535 .....	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act .....	H. Res. 144	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 584 .....	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery of the State of Iowa .....	H. Res. 145	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 614 .....	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility .....	H. Res. 146	Open .....	N/A
H. Con. Res. 67 .....	Budget Resolution .....	H. Res. 149	Restrictive: Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order: Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D:1R
H.R. 1561 .....	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 155	Restrictive: Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A
H.R. 1530 .....	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996 .....	H. Res. 164	Restrictive: Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R: 18D: 2 Bipartisan
H.R. 1817 .....	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996 .....	H. Res. 167	Open: waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate: Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	.....
H.R. 1854 .....	Legislative Branch Appropriations .....	H. Res. 169	Restrictive: Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R: 4D: 2 Bipartisan

\* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. \*\* All legislation, 65% restrictive; 35% open. \*\*\* Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. \*\*\*\* Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] bring up that very important subject which we have permitted to be addressed by virtue of making in order an amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] that

will allow Members to return unspent portions of their office expense accounts to the Treasury to be used specifically for deficit reduction.

This is a fair rule, Mr. Speaker. It has been a rule that has been well thought through. There has been very close work and cooperation between the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on House Oversight, and

the Committee on Rules. I think it is a good piece of work that we have brought before the floor today, before our colleagues today, and I would urge that our colleagues adopt this rule and move this bill onto the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a table reflecting the amendment process under special rules reported by the Committee on Rules.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,<sup>1</sup> 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 19, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open <sup>2</sup> .....	46	44	29	73
Modified Closed <sup>3</sup> .....	49	47	11	27
Closed <sup>4</sup> .....	9	9	0	0
Totals .....	104	100	40	100

<sup>1</sup> This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

<sup>2</sup> An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

<sup>3</sup> A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

<sup>4</sup> A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

## SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95) .....	O .....	H.R. 5 .....	Unfunded Mandate Reform .....	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95) .....	MC .....	H. Con. Res. 17 .....	Social Security .....	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95) .....	O .....	H.J. Res. 1 .....	Balanced Budget Amdt .....	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95) .....	O .....	H.R. 101 .....	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians .....	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95) .....	O .....	H.R. 400 .....	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve .....	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95) .....	O .....	H.R. 440 .....	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif .....	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95) .....	O .....	H.R. 2 .....	Line Item Veto .....	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95) .....	O .....	H.R. 665 .....	Victim Restitution .....	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95) .....	O .....	H.R. 666 .....	Exclusionary Rule Reform .....	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 66 (2/9/95) .....	O .....	H.R. 667 .....	Violent Criminal Incarceration .....	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95) .....	O .....	H.R. 668 .....	Criminal Alien Deportation .....	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95) .....	MO .....	H.R. 728 .....	Law Enforcement Block Grants .....	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95) .....	MO .....	H.R. 7 .....	National Security Revitalization .....	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95) .....	MC .....	H.R. 831 .....	Health Insurance Deductibility .....	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95) .....	O .....	H.R. 830 .....	Paperwork Reduction Act .....	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95) .....	MC .....	H.R. 889 .....	Defense Supplemental .....	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95) .....	MO .....	H.R. 450 .....	Regulatory Transition Act .....	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95) .....	MO .....	H.R. 1022 .....	Risk Assessment .....	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95) .....	O .....	H.R. 926 .....	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act .....	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95) .....	MO .....	H.R. 925 .....	Private Property Protection Act .....	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95) .....	MO .....	H.R. 988 .....	Attorney Accountability Act .....	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95) .....	MO .....	H.R. 1058 .....	Securities Litigation Reform .....	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95) .....	MO .....	.....	.....	A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95) .....	Debate .....	H.R. 956 .....	Product Liability Reform .....	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95) .....	MC .....	.....	.....	PQ: 234-191 A: 247-181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95) .....	MO .....	H.R. 1159 .....	Making Emergency Supp. Appropriations .....	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95) .....	MC .....	H.J. Res. 73 .....	Term Limits Const. Amdt .....	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95) .....	Debate .....	H.R. 4 .....	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 .....	A: voice vote (3/21/95).



## SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of June 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217–211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423–1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228–204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253–172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414–4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233–176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	National Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 233–183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1617	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O—open rule; MO—modified open rule; MC—modified closed rule; C—closed rule; A—adoption vote; PQ—previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed until completion of action on House Resolution 168.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I was objecting to a vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes that.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### ESTABLISHING A CORRECTIONS CALENDAR IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 168 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 168

*Resolved*, That clause 4 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"4. (a) After a bill has been favorably reported and placed on either the Union or House Calendar, the Speaker may, after consultation with the Minority Leader, file with the Clerk a notice requesting that such bill also be placed upon a special calendar to be known as the "Corrections Calendar". On the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month, after the Pledge of Allegiance, the Speaker may direct the Clerk to call the bills in numerical order which have been on the Corrections Calendar for three legislative days.

"(b) A bill so called shall be considered in the House, debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the primary committee of jurisdiction reporting the bill, shall not be subject to amendment except those amendments recommended by the primary committee of jurisdiction or those of-

ferred by the chairman of the primary committee, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment there to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

"(c) A three-fifths vote of the members voting shall be required to pass any bill called from the Corrections Calendar but the rejection of any such bill, or the sustaining of any point of order against it or its consideration, shall not cause it to be removed from the Calendar to which it was originally referred."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 168 is the long-awaited reform to create a new House Corrections Calendar for legislation that would repeal or correct laws, rules, and regulations that are obsolete, ludicrous, duplicative, burdensome, or costly.

The idea was first proposed by our Speaker back in February of this year, and it has since captured the imagination and enthusiastic support of our colleagues and the American people alike.

The resolution amends clause 4 of House Rule 13 by repealing the obsolete Consent Calendar and by replacing it with the new Corrections Calendar.

The Consent Calendar has not been used since the 101st Congress and, even then, was only used for three bills.

For bills to be placed on the Corrections Calendar, they must first be reported by the committee of jurisdiction and placed on their normal Calendar. The Speaker could then place the bills on the Corrections Calendar after consultation with the minority leader.

The Calendar could be called on the second or fourth Tuesday of each month, at the discretion of the Speaker, after the Pledge of Allegiance. Bills

would be called in the numerical order of their placement on the Calendar, after pending there for at least 3 legislative days, following the existing rules of the House.

The bills would be debated for 1 hour equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the primary committee of jurisdiction. No amendments would be allowed unless recommended by the primary committee or offered by its chairman.

Each bill would provide for one motion to recommit with or without instructions. That means a final, alternative amendment or substitute could be considered, debatable for 10 minutes divided between the proponent and an opponent.

Finally, the rule provides for a three-fifths vote to pass a bill on the Corrections Calendar.

We think the three-fifths super-majority vote for Corrections Calendar bills is a reasonable middle ground between a two-thirds, which is used for suspensions when the bills are reasonably noncontroversial, and a simple majority vote when bills are extremely controversial. The bills should be relatively noncontroversial and bipartisan, but there is bound to be some controversy on some of these measures. Even so-called stupid rules will have their defenders.

Given the prospect of some controversy on some corrections bills, we purposely built-in the ability of the minority to offer an amendment as part of a motion to recommit with instructions. This is something that is not available under the suspension process.

Nor do bills have to be reported from a committee to be considered under suspension. It was the strong feeling of the Speaker and his advisory group that drafted this proposal that regular process should be followed at the committee level for a bill to be eligible for the Corrections Calendar.

Moreover, suspension bills can be in violation of House rules and still be considered. Corrections bills do not have such protection against points of order. They must be in conformity with House rules. The only exception is that a corrections bill will not be subject to the point of order that it should be considered in the Committee of the Whole. Instead, the bills will be considered in the House under the 1-hour rule.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Speaker on originating this idea and on following through on it by appointing